

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application and for indicating that claims 3-6, 9-12 and 17-19 contain allowable subject matter. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner objected to claim 8 and required appropriate correction. Claim 8 has been amended to recite "field effect transistors." In addition, an antecedent basis correction was made to claim 20. No other amendments have been made and no new issues are raised by the current amendments.

Claims 1, 2, 13-16 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Amemiya (U.S. patent number 3,737,797). Claims 1 recites in part, "a plurality of common-emitter amplifier circuits, which are different in voltage gain." Claim 2 recites in part, "a plurality of amplifier circuits, which are different in voltage gain." The Examiner cites Amemiya at Fig. 2 as teaching amplifiers (Q1, Q'1, Q3, Q'3) having different voltage gains, based on resistors 17 and 18 allegedly having different resistance values. Amemiya does not teach any particular resistance values for resistors 17 and 18. Amemiya teaches that the circuit of Fig. 2 operates as a *normal differential amplifier* when a switch 19 is in the AMPL position (4:3-4). For the circuit of Fig. 2 to operate as a normal differential amplifier, the gain due to transistors Q1 and Q'1 would necessarily be equal, not different as required by claims 1 and 2. Amemiya further teaches that, when the switch 19 is in the INH position, a DC current of $i/2$ flows through each of the transistors Q1, Q'1, Q3 and Q'3 because they are *matched* to each other, and that the amplifier has a *good common mode rejection* (4:5-14). In teaching that the transistors Q1, Q'1, Q3 and Q'3 are matched and that the amplifier has a good common mode rejection, Amemiya does not teach or suggest any amplifiers which are different in voltage gain. In fact, Amemiya teaches the exact opposite. Because Amemiya fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 1 and 2, claims 1 and 2 are allowable over Amemiya.

Claims 13-15 and 20 depend from claim 1 and claim 16 depends from claim 2. Therefore, claims 13-16 and 20 are also allowable over Amemia.

Claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amemiya. Claim 7 recites in part, "a plurality of...amplifier circuits which are different in voltage gain." Claim 8 recites in part, "a plurality of amplifier circuits which are different in voltage gain." The noted limitations were discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 2. For the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 2, claims 7 and 8 are allowable over Amemiya.

Claims 3-6, 9-12 and 17-19 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The objections should be withdrawn for the reasons discussed above.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 37686.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 
Brad C. Spencer, Reg. No. 57076

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: January 17, 2007